The New-York Times.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 2486. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1859. PRICE TWO CENTS.

NATIONAL POLITICS.

The Issues of the Next Presidential Campaign.

The Great Questions of Non-Intervention and Popular Sovereignty.

Speech of Senator Douglas at Columbus, Ohio.

Special Telegraphic Report for the New-York Times.

COLUMBUS, Wednesday, Sept. 7.

Mr. Senator DOUGLAS arrived in this city this morning. His approach was received at the depot by the military and an immense crowd of citizens, with the greatest enthusiasm. He was immediately escorted to his hotel.

On his arrival in Cincinnati yesterday he was met by a committee of five hundred, appointed by the Democratic Executive Committee, and a great crowd of citizens and strangers on their way to hear him speak in this city. Crowds have been flooding in here all day. Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the multitude this afternoon, and his remarks were received with enthusiastic demonstrations of applause. He spoke as follows:

MR. DOUGLAS' SPEECH.

"FELLOW-CITIZENS OF OHIO: In compliance with the invitation of your State Central Committee, I appear before you to-day for the purpose of discussing some of those great leading topics which now agitate the public mind of this country. It is not my intention to enter into an examination of any one question pertaining to the local and domestic policy of your own State, because, in regard to the interests and concerns of your State, I hold my political action bound by that great principle of the Nebraska bill which lets every political community to regulate its own affairs and mind its own business, and not to interfere with those of its neighbors. [Cheers, and cries of "Good."] But there are certain great principles, of universal application, which it is proper to discuss in all parts of the Confederation in the same way, and to enforce by the same arguments. I maintain any political creed to be unsound which cannot be avowed in Chicago the same as in New-Orleans. If the Democratic creed cannot be avowed and practiced in Ohio the same as in Kentucky, in the North as well as in the South, there must be something radically wrong. So long as we live under a common Constitution, which is the supreme law of the entire public, our political creed should be as broad as the Republic and as universal as that Constitution. I wish to invite your attention to-day to those great principles which underlie the Democracy and all the other political parties in this country upon this vexed question of Slavery, which for the last few years seems to have absorbed all other questions. The Democratic Party hold that it is the right of the people of every State, of every Territory and every political community within this Confederacy to decide that question to suit themselves. We not only apply that principle to the question of Slavery, but we extend it to all the local and domestic institutions of all the States and all the Territories of the Union. On the other hand, we are told by the leaders of the Republican Party that there is an irrepressible conflict between Freedom and Slavery, free labor and slave labor, Free States and Slave States, and that it is their intention to continue to excite, agitate and divide the country until Slavery shall be abolished or established throughout the country. In other words, the Republican Party hold that there must be uniformity in the local institutions of all the States and Territories of the Union. Mr. SEWARD, in his Rochester speech, says that it is an irrepressible conflict between enduring force, that must last until uniformity shall be established. Mr. LINCOLN, in the Illinois canvass of last year, compared it to a house divided against itself which could not stand, and said that this Union could not permanently endure divided into Free and Slave States, as our fathers made it. Hence you find that in the platform of the Republican Party, adopted in Philadelphia in 1856, it is declared that Congress possesses sovereign powers over all the territories of the Union, and that it is both their right and their duty to exercise that power for the abolishment and prohibition of African Slavery. Here is posted at once the line of conflict between the Republicans and the Democratic Party. The Republican Party hold that the Federal Government can decide the slavery question for the people of the Territories and the new States; we Democrats maintain that the Federal Government has no right to interfere with the question, either to establish, to protect, to abolish, or to prohibit slavery; but that the people in each State and each Territory, shall be left entirely free to decide it for themselves. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) This question of the right of the people in their local legislatures, to decide all internal questions to suit themselves, is not a new doctrine. It is as old as the principles of free government on the American Continent. It was the first question that seriously divided the American Colonies from the British Government, and out of which the first serious cause of quarrel arose. The American Colonies claimed the right in their Colonial legislatures to regulate the slavery question, and all other matters affecting their internal policy, to suit themselves, without the interference of the British Parliament, or any other power on earth. In accordance with that right, as early as 1699, the Colonial legislature of Virginia passed a law imposing heavy penalties upon all slaves brought into that Colony subsequently to the date of that act. Virginia did not pass that law because of her hostility to African slavery, but she did it as a matter of domestic policy, affecting her own interests and her own safety. The Colony of Virginia was a feeble settlement, surrounded by formidable savage tribes of Indians, and the large number of African savages poured into her midst made her feel a vital need for the safety of her firesides, and stimulated her to the enactment of a law for her own preservation, by which a tax was imposed upon all African slaves subsequently brought into the Colony. So soon as that tax was levied, the British merchants who [illegible] to him, and hold it there in defiance of the [illegible] law, and that Virginia had no right to exclude them or their property by a mere legislative enactment. It strikes me that I have heard that argument substantially urged since [illegible]. It strikes me that I have heard a very similar [illegible] advanced in the American Congress, and [illegible] in modern days that same proposition has found its advocates in America. The British King, after mature consideration, decided in favor of the British trader, and against the right of the people of Virginia to exclude Slavery from their limits by legislative enactment. He immediately passed another Act, intended to force Slavery on it, and then another, and still another, [illegible] who had passed thirty-one laws, each designed to [illegible] the right of the Colony to decide the Slavery question for itself. In 1775, four years before the Declaration of Independence, Virginia passed another Act, imposing a 6 per cent. tax upon all slaves brought into the Colony, and, in addition, petitioned the King to [illegible] the restrictions upon the right of the Colony to regulate the question to suit themselves, and notified him in that memorial that if he did not grant that petition the citizens in Virginia were in danger, inasmuch as the King that our fathers would fight for the right to decide the Slavery question for themselves. Such is the Colonial record. Such is the Colonies claimed the right. Read the history of the Colonies up to the time of the Revolution, and you will find almost every Assembled for the first time, in 1774, they for their first act adopted a Bill of Rights for the Colonies. Look into that Bill of Rights, and you will find the great foundation principles upon which all of our institutions have been based since in that Bill of Rights. The Colonies first declared that they are willing to grant to Great Britain the right to regulate commerce and decide all their questions of a general character, but they said that they claimed for themselves the free and exclusive power of legislation in their provincial Legislatures upon all subjects of internal policy. There is the principle, distinctly asserted, for which they went to war. It was the principle that every colony has a right to decide for itself, in its own Legislature, all questions of taxation and internal policy. That was a reply to the preamble to the Stamp Act, in which the Parliament of England had declared its right to bind the Colonies in all cases whatsoever. It will be seen, therefore, that the Tories of the Revolution held at that day that the Imperial Parliament had a right to govern the Territories as it pleased, not only in general matters, but in matters affecting their local interests, Slavery included. The Colonies, on the other hand, denied that pretension of the Tories, and said that they as Colonies had the exclusive right to decide all questions of Territorial policy, Slavery included, to suit themselves. The Declaration of Independence was put forth, and all the battles of the Revolution were fought in vindication of that great principle. Our fathers did not at first desire independence—they protested that they did not wish to separate from Great Britain; but what they contended for was the right of local self-government in their internal affairs, without the interference of Parliament, and if they could not obtain that right under the British Government, they would declare their independence and fight for the right. They did fight the battle out nobly, for seven long years. They carried in triumph the flag of local self-government for the Colonies, until at last Great Britain recognized their independence, and the war ceased. After the independence was established, the different States ceded to the Federal Government the land which they held in the western country to the north of the Ohio River. This country, where we are now assembled, belonged to the State of Virginia, and she ceded it to the Government—first for the common benefit of the Union, on condition that it should be formed into States and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. That deed of cession was accepted on the 1st day of March, 1784, and on the same day THOS. JEFFERSON, the author of the Declaration of Independence, reported his plan for the government of the new Territories or new States west of the Ohio River. By that plan the Territories were recognized as States, the people having the right to decide all international questions to suit themselves. It is true that Mr. JEFFERSON proposed to obtain their consent to a proposition prohibiting Slavery—not that the present Government had the right or power—but he asked for their consent to such a compact, and Congress struck out the clause and passed the plan of Mr. JEFFERSON recognizing these Territories as States and the right of the people inhabiting them to decide the Slavery question to suit themselves, without the interference of Congress or of any other State or power on earth. Thus you find that up to the time the Constitution was adopted this great principle of local self-government was maintained in the government of the new Territories, or new States as they were then called. Now let me ask you, is it reasonable to suppose, after our fathers had fought the battles of the Revolution in behalf of the right of each Colony to govern itself in respect to its local and domestic concerns, that then they conferred upon Congress the arbitrary sovereign power which they had refused to the British Parliament? ("Cries of "Never."") The Republican Party, in their Philadelphia National Convention, affirmed that Congress has sovereign power over the Territories for their government, and that it is their duty to prohibit Slavery. This is precisely the principle asserted by the British Parliament over the American Colonies. That Parliament and the Tories of King George's time asserted that the former had sovereign power for the government of the Colonies, and the Republican Party now repeat that Congress possesses sovereign power for the government of the Territories. WASHINGTON, JEFFERSON, HANCOCK, FRANKLIN, and the sages of the Revolution decided that the Colonies, Provinces and Territories, when organized as political communities, had the inalienable right to govern themselves in respect to their local and domestic concerns. That is precisely what I now assert on behalf of the Territories. Let me ask you, as American citizens, whether the people of the American Territories under our Constitution are not entitled to as many rights as the inhabitants of the British Colonies were before the Revolution? Our fathers, previous to the Revolution, declared that it was the inalienable birthright of Englishmen, when forming political communities, to govern themselves in their internal polity. Now if that was the birthright of Englishmen before the Revolution, did it not become the birthright of all Americans after the Revolution?—and by virtue of it to govern themselves without the interference of the American Congress? I only claim for the people of the Territories those same rights for which our fathers fought for the American Colonies. Remember the Revolution was not fought for the right of sovereign States. Our fathers were contending for the rights of Colonies, of Provinces, of dependent Territories, when they asserted this inalienable right of local self-government; and we are asserting now, in behalf of the people of the American Territories, the same great inalienable right. Why should it not be granted? The Republicans tell us that they are willing to grant this right of self government in the Territories in all cases excepting the negro. They do not deny that the people of the Territories are capable of making all laws to regulate the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, and guardian and ward, or all laws affecting white men; but, there is something so sacred in the rights of the negro that they will not trust them to the same legislature that controls yours and mine. [Laughter and cheers.] Then, down south in Kentucky and a few other States, there are a number of gentlemen calling themselves the Opposition Party, who say that they are not willing to trust their right of property in negro slaves to the protection of the local law. Bear in mind that Congress never passed a law for the protection of any kind of property whatever in the Territories of the United States. Congress never passed a criminal code for any organized territory. If any man steals your horse, you do not look to Congress, but to the local law, for protection. If he robs your house or your store you cannot apply to Congress, but must go to the local law for protection. All crimes perpetrated against the rights and property of the citizen are punished in the State courts or in the Territorial courts, and not in the Federal courts. Property, life, all your rights, are under the protection of the local law. Then, if my horse, or your oxen, or dry goods, or property of *every* kind, is dependent upon the local law for protection, not only in the States but in the Territories, why should not negro property be subject to the same local law? I hold that the people of the Territories have the same right to legislate in regard to slave property that they have in regard to any and every other kind of property. ("Right," and applause.) The Constitution places all kinds of property on an equal footing. The Northern and the Southern man enter the Territory on an exact equality, and carry their property with them, and hold it there subject to the local law. If that local law is for them, then they will be protected; if it is against them, they had better keep their property somewhere else. Why, then, should we prohibit the settlers of the Territory from introducing or excluding Slavery, either to gratify the Republicans in the North, or the Southern Oppositionists in the slave States? If we will only apply the great principle of non-intervention by Congress, and self-government in the Territories, leaving the people to do as they please, there will be peace and harmony between all sections of the Union. What interest have you in Ohio in the question of Slavery in South Carolina? You say that you do not think that Slavery is necessary or beneficial. That may be true, but your opinion might be different if your property was all invested in a nice plantation in South Carolina, where the white man cannot live and cultivate the soil. In Ohio it is a question only between the white man and the negro. [Laughter.] But if you go farther South you will find that it is a question between the negro and the crocodile. [Renewed laughter.] The question then may be a very different one under different climates. Our fathers, when they framed this Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now. They knew when they made this Republic that a country so broad as ours, with such a variety of climate, soil and productions, must have a variety of interests, requiring different laws adapted to each locality. They knew that the laws which would suit the green hills of New-England were illy adapted to the rice plantations of South Carolina; that the laws and regulations which would suit the corn and wheat fields of Ohio might not be well adapted to the sugar plantations of Louisiana; that the people in different localities, having a different climate, different interests and necessities, would want different laws adapted to each locality and when the Constitution was made, it was based on the theory that each State should decide every question for itself, and also all the local and domestic questions. At that time the Union was composed of thirteen States, twelve of which were Slave and one was a Free State. Suppose Gov. HAMILTON had lived in those days—had been a member of that Convention and suppose he had risen in his seat and declared that there must be conformity in the local institutions of the different States; or rather, suppose that Mr. SEWARD had then been living, and a member of that Convention, and had asserted that there must be such uniformity, and had said that there was an irrepressible conflict between free labor and slave labor, free institutions and slave institutions, and that they could not exist together but must become all free or all slave—what do you think would have been the result? Do you suppose that Slavery would have been prohibited in States by the Constitution? Would the one State of Massachusetts have outvoted the other twelve Slave States, and have prohibited Slavery? On the other hand, if this modern Republican doctrine of uniformity had then prevailed, would it not have established Slavery by a constitutional provision in the South of American soil? ("True," and cheers.) You see that if this doctrine of uniformity had been prevailed, the twelve Slaveholding States would have outvoted the one Free State, and have established Slavery over the whole Confederacy by an irrepressible constitutional provision. The framers of freedom then protected against minority, and contended that each State should decide the question for itself, just as the Colonies had contended before them. (Cheers.) Under that great principle of popular sovereignty, one-half of the original Slaveholding States have since abolished Slavery. Connecticut, New-Hampshire, Rhode Island, New-York, New-Jersey and Pennsylvania have each abolished Slavery. This result was not accomplished by the Wilmot Proviso, or by the Ordinance of 1787, or by the Republican Platform, or by the action of Congress, but it was abolished by the free and voluntary action of the people in each State, acting as they pleased. [Hear, hear.] I have often been told in Illinois by the Republicans, and I suppose you have heard the same here, that Illinois is a Free State, because of the sagacity of our fathers in adopting the Ordinance of 1787. I have heard of people assembling in the Western Reserve of Ohio, and celebrating with great pomp and veneration the 13th of July, because it was the day on which the Ordinance of 1787 was passed, prohibiting Slavery northwest of the Ohio River, and the learned speakers would tell the present generation that you are a Free State in Ohio because of that Ordinance. I should not have the same respect for my fellow-citizens of Ohio, which I do so sincerely entertain, if I thought that you were free merely because you could not help it. [Great applause.] They tell you that Ohio is not free, because she is composed of men; is not free, because every man has a heart that loves freedom; is not free, because she wishes and desires, but she is free because Congress has said so fifty years ago, and would not let her be otherwise. [Cheers.] I tell the people of my State that if they were only free because Congress would not allow them to be otherwise, they do not deserve their freedom. [Great applause.] No people deserve freedom except those who cherish and love it, and will fight for it when they win it. ["Cries of "That's right" and cheers.] Gentlemen of Ohio, you are a Free State because you chose to be free. [Cries of "That's the doctrine."] You are a Free State because you choose to make your own laws, decide your own policy at the ballot-box; and you have the laws under which you are now governed because you made them, and not because Congress told you that you must have them. I recognize your right to make just such local laws and establish just such domestic institutions as you choose. When I travel and stop and spend a day with you, as on this occasion, if I do not like your laws I hope I will have the good sense to keep it to myself, and mind my own business—[laughter and applause]—and if you should find any citizen of Illinois coming here, into Ohio, and telling you that your laws do not suit him, all you have to do is to tell him that you did not make them for him—[great laughter]—that you made them for yourselves, and they suit you; and if he does not like them, he can continue to live on the other side of the Wabash. So it would be everywhere throughout the country. If old Virginia, who owns you, the land where you now live, and where that magnificent temple of liberty has been erected (pointing to the State Capitol) and who you ought to respect, should send her citizens here to tell you that she does not like your laws, answer that your veneration cannot protect her in her impudence in interfering with your rights of self-government. [Applause.] If you go over to Virginia to steal her negroes, I trust she will catch you and put you in jail with other thieves. [Laughter and applause.] If you do not like old Virginia's laws, stay on this side of the Ohio River and mind your own business. If this principle is observed, there will be peace and harmony between all the different States of the Union; but we find some men who have settled down here in Ohio, who have come to the conclusion that because you have a law that suits you here everybody else ought to have it. Suppose you were to apply that same rule to the social circle, what would become of your peace and harmony? Must every lady wear the same bonnet, and every man wear the same dress? Must we have uniformity throughout? Because you have a good thing, do you think it is good for everybody else? [Laughter.] Does every principle extend to every man? There is tyranny in that family that compels every member of it to exact obedience to one man's will. There is tyranny wherever you compel uniformity, by the power of the Federal Government in the local domestic institutions of a people. [Applause.] The great principle of liberty is to leave every man and every woman perfectly free in their action to the full extent that is consistent with the safety and the peace of society, and that principle should be applied to States, territories, and political communities as well as to individuals. Let that principle prevail, and there will be a happy brotherhood between the Free and Slave States. Why cannot we now live in peace with our Southern brethren as we did in times of old, when we fought by their sides and they by ours, to establish the right of the Colonies and Territories to govern themselves? You found there the patriot army commanded by the illustrious WASHINGTON, and Southern men under him and surrounding him. You found Southern and Northern men fighting in a common cause, pouring out their blood upon the same battle-field, and exposing their lives to the same hazard, in order that they and their posterity in all time to come, might enjoy those great principles of self-government, for which they were struggling. Why cannot we Southern and Northern men now join, and side by side as before, in a common cause, protect the right of every State and every Territory, every colony and every province, to govern itself in respect to its own local and domestic concerns? Why should the North be arrayed against the South, and the South against the North? These geographical parties are of recent origin. They were unknown in the times of the Revolution, when our liberties were first established. Go to one of the Republican meetings, and you will find their orators will deal in appeals to the Southern passions and Southern prejudices against Northern people and Northern institutions. What is the object of these men now in thus fanning the flames of sectional strife at the North and the South, dividing the people by a geographical line, and making them enemies on the right of the line to those who are on the left? To what patriotic object can this course be pursued that is the object of the Republican Party, except it be to fan sectional strife and discord? Take their platform from the beginning to the end, and it has a negro under every plank. There is not a white plank in their entire platform. It is all armed against the South, and if you go South among the fire-eaters of Louisiana you will find their petitions aimed as directly against the North. A northern man does not know the bad set of men he belives among until he goes down South and hears it, and a Southern man does not know what a bad character he is until he attends a Republican meeting and hears himself described. Now, the Democratic Party desires to harmonize all conflicting interests and passions in the Republic, upon that great principle which underlies all our institutions, and declares that the people in every State and every territory shall be free to decide the Slavery question, and every other question for themselves. But the trouble is that you will find every once in a while a man—I know that there are not enough of them in the country to make mile posts along the railroad—but there is once in a while a man who will tell you that Slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, and wherever a North-ern man makes that discovery you will find that the Southerner at once seizes it and declares that if Slavery does exist in the Territory by authority of the Constitution, it is then the duty of Congress to pass all laws necessary to protect the rights secured by the Constitution; and then comes the demand for the Slave code in the Territories. Now, there need be no diversity of principle on this question if each man will read the Constitution of the United States, and then take an oath to support it. Just look into the Constitution, and then you will find what a slave is, who may be a slave, where they may be held, and by what authority they are held. You will find it all in one section. I have not the book with me, but I can repeat that section to you.

"No person held to service in labor in one State under the law thereof, escaping into another, shall be released by any law, or regulation therein, but shall be delivered up to the party to whom said service or labor may be due."

Now, by the express provisions of that clause of the Constitution, a slave is a person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof—not under the Constitution of the United States—not under the laws of the United States—not by virtue of any Federal Authority, but in a State under the laws thereof. What becomes of this newly-discovered doctrine that Slavery exists everywhere by virtue of the Constitution of the United States? It is denied by the Constitution itself. Every child who has ever read the instrument knows that Slavery is the creature of the local law, exists only where the local law sanctions and establishes it, and exists only in a State under the laws thereof; and inasmuch as a Territory is a State within the meaning of that clause of the Constitution, Slavery may exist in a Territory the same as in a State, under the laws thereof. Hence, if the people of a Territory desire Slavery, all they have to do is to pass laws sanctioning and protecting it. If they do not want Slavery, all they have to do is to withhold all legislation and all protection. Thus you find that the people of the territories, as well as of the States, have the right to regulate that question for themselves. But there will come up a question at the opening of the next session of Congress that will put the Republicans to the test in the doctrine of Federal Intervention; and not only the Republicans but the Southern opposition to the Democracy also. The people of New-Mexico, which Territory was organized in 1850, refused for many years to sanction or protect Slavery, but about twelve months ago the Legislature passed a law establishing a Slave code for the Territory, and protecting the institution in their midst. On the other hand, in the territory of Kansas, which was organized in 1854, the first Legislature that assembled passed a slave code and established Slavery in the Territory, and that act remained on the statute books until the 9th day of February, 1858, when they passed another act in the following words:

Be it enacted, That an act entitled "An Act to punish offences against slave property," which took effect on the 15th of September, 1855, be and the same is hereby repealed.

By that unfriendly legislation on the part of Kansas *in repealing all laws providing for the protection of* slave property, all laws punishing crimes against slave property, and all laws conferring jurisdiction upon the Courts to try men for offences against that kind of property, Slavery has been and is excluded from the Territory; and by the Slave Code established in New-Mexico under the name it was repealed in Kansas, Slavery exists in the Territory. Now, the Republican Party, by its Platform, adopted at Philadelphia, assume that it is the power and duty of Congress to establish Slavery everywhere in the Territories, and we may expect to see that Party, at the opening of the next session of Congress, bring in a bill to repeal the Slave Code of New-Mexico, and to prohibit Slavery in that Territory. If they are consistent and sincere men they will do it, for it is the fundamental article in their creed—the cornerstone in their temple—the only territorial plank in their platform. If they are honest men they must bring forward their bill to repeal the Slave code of New-Mexico, and if the same think that Mr. SEWARD brings in his bill to abolish Slavery in that Territory, we must expect to find a Kentucky member of Congress—one of those recently elected by the Opposition—upon the doctrine of Congressional intervention, bringing in a bill to establish a Slave code for Kansas. Of course, the Southern Opposition, who are pledged to Congressional intervention and Congressional protection of Slavery in the Territories, must bring forward their bill to establish and protect Slavery in Kansas. Thus we have presented to us two cases for Congressional intervention—one from the North and the other from the South—one against Slavery and the other for Slavery—one to compel the people not to have Slavery when they want it, and the other to compel the people to have Slavery when they do not want it. Now, what is to be the position of the Democratic Party when these two bills are brought up for Congressional action. I can tell you what course one man will pursue. It will be to tell the Republicans that they shall not interfere with the institutions of New-Mexico, and then to say to the Southern interventionists: "Hands off—you shall not touch the domestic institutions of Kansas!" [Cries of "Right," and cheers.] We will say to the Republicans: "If the people of New-Mexico want a slave code, they have a right to it, and if they desire Slavery, let them have it until they get tired of it, and then let them abolish it themselves. It is their business, not ours." And then to the Southern men we will say, "If the people of Kansas do not want Slavery, it shall not be forced on them; if they do not want a slave code, Congress shall not force one upon them; if they ever desire one, let them make it themselves. It is their business—affects their rights and interests, and let them adjust it satisfactorily to themselves." With all due respect to this intelligent audience, permit me to say that it is a great mistake for you to suppose that you know better what the people of New Mexico want than they do themselves. It is a great mistake for Southern opposition-ists and Southern lecturers, to imagine that they know better what the people of Kansas need than the people who live there. It is a great mistake to suppose that you or they are any more disinterested than the people of the Territories themselves. If you are capable of deciding the Slavery question for yourselves in Ohio, and have brains enough not only to decide it here but to decide it for the people of Kansas and New-Mexico, would you be any less capable to decide so when you moved to these Territories, and became citizens of them? Who are the people of the Territories that they are not capable of self-government? Are they not your brothers and cousins, and sons and fathers? Are they not as capable of governing themselves there as you are of governing yourselves here? [Cries of "Yes," and applause.] Why, then, should you try to interfere with them? Oh, you are afraid they will make bad laws! Well, if they do make bad laws, perhaps you would not have much the advantage of them. Still, I will not say you have bad laws in Ohio, but I do know some States where the laws are not very good ones; but if they choose to make bad laws it is their right to do it, and let them suffer under them until they get tired of them, when they will elect members to the Legislature who will repeal them. This pretence that you cannot trust the people for fear they will ruin themselves by bad laws, is always the resort of tyrants the world over. Just go to FRANCIS JOSEPH of Austria, and ask him why he did not allow the Italians over in Lombardy to make their own laws. He would tell you at once that if he had done so they would have ruined themselves by bad laws. So it is throughout the world. Tyrants and despots never will trust a people because they are not capable of governing themselves. They love the people so much, that they will not allow them to burn their fingers and ruin themselves by bad legislation. No; this doctrine that the people of a Territory cannot govern themselves will not do. Whenever there are people enough in a Territory to entitle them to be admitted into a government, they are capable of self-government. If they are not, why do you give them a government? If they are not able to make laws to govern themselves in respect to their domestic concerns, why do you give them a legislative at all? You hear gentlemen say that the first few settlers were squatters on the public domain, and ought not to be permitted to make laws for other people who have not yet gone there. Well, if they ought not to be permitted to make laws, why do you give them a government? Why do you give it to them unless they are enough to constitute a government, and are able to exercise the power after you have given it to them? This cry about squatter sovereignty has failed to frighten the children anywhere North of South. When the term was first used by Gen. CASS, I was alluding not to the powers of a territorial government under the Constitution and laws of the United States, but to the right of a few squatters on the public domain, but in violation of law, to set up a government independent of the Government of the United States. For instance, a large number of people had gone to Oregon before the treaty of joint occupancy had been annulled, and before we had extended the laws of the United States over it, and pending no law to protect them, they established a Government of their own, and by that Government excluded Slavery. The Government was against the laws of the United States, was not accountable to the United States, and Mr. CALHOUN pronounced it squatter sovereignty because the settlers were there in violation of law, and had a Government in antagonism to that of the United States. Well, he denounced that, and since his death you will find young Calhouts all around the country, talking about squatter sovereignty, without knowing how they are applying the terms; but, still it is what you call it, I hold that it is the inherent inalienable right of all American citizens, when forming themselves into governments according to law, to govern themselves in respect to their local and domestic concerns; and I will apply that principle to the Territories as well as to the States. Let it only be observed, and this people can live in peace forever, and the Union can continue to exist in all time to come, divided into Free and Slave States, as our fathers made it. Adopt that principle, and this Government is capable of indefinite expansion. Steady growth and gradual expansion is one of the laws of our national existence. With the rapid national increase and the foreign emigration and fraternization, more territory is required for homes for our citizens. It was thought when the Revolution was fought that the few States along the Atlantic slope were all the territory that would ever be needed. The doctrine of that day was that the Ohio Valley was too far off to be united with the Atlantic States. At another period it was thought that we would never wish to go beyond the Mississippi River, and that there was more territory east of it than we would ever want; but a few years more exposed the folly of such an idea, and Mr. JEFFERSON acquired LOUISIANA, extending our domains to the Rocky Mountains, and perhaps including part of Oregon. Still there were those who thought we had territory enough and too much. In the days of John Quincey Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, Harrison, and Tyler, there was a settled policy to remove the Indians from Ohio, Indiana, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, and plant them on the west side of the Mississippi, in Arkansas, Missouri, and Iowa, making a perpetual barrier from Texas to Canada, by pledging the faith of this nation that they should never be disturbed in their new settlements, or included within any State or Territory so long as grass should grow and water run. The idea was to make an Indian barrier, beyond which civilization, Christianity and Democracy should never go. I had the honor to be the first to make the assault upon that policy that was to separate the Mississippi Valley from the Pacific Ocean, and I brought in the Nebraska bill as early as 1843-'44 to break up that policy. I renewed it each year for ten years until I broke the barrier through, and the last finishing touch by which it was brought about was given by my friend here, Col. MAHTFEMMY, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who had the glory of doing the finishing act that broke the barrier and consecrated to settlement the whole country stretching to the Pacific Ocean. Now we have reached the Pacific, we have acquired California and New-Mexico, we are told that we have enough and we will never want more. That is what they told me in 1850, when they made the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty about Central America. I denounced it in the Senate, because it contained a pledge that neither the United States nor Great Britain would ever colonize, annex or exercise dominion over any part of Central America. They asked me what I wanted with Central America; I told them I did not want it then, but the time would come when our safety and destiny would compel us to take it, and I would never pledge the faith of this nation to any foreign power; that we would never do it at all time to come what our interest, safety, and honor might compel us to do. I resisted the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, therefore, because it contained a pledge that the United States would never acquire dominion over our great highway to California. Why, they said, it was so far we would never want it. I told them yes, it was a good ways off—that it was half way to California, and on the direct route to it. Well, perhaps, the time has not yet come for us to want Central America, but the time is coming. We are bound to extend and spread until we absorb the entire continent of America, including the adjacent islands, and become one grand ocean bound republic. [Cheers.] I do not care whether you like it or not; you cannot help it: *It is the decree of Providence.* This continent was set apart as an asylum for the oppressed of the whole world, and as a nursery for liberty,—and here the people are collecting from all parts of the world, and taking shelter under the shadows of the great tree of Liberty. This emigration cannot be stopped, and you must have more land. A wise man always conforms his action to a policy which he cannot prevent, and hence I say, *Let America have a policy in* harmony with her destiny. Let us be what *our numbers and what our position* require us to be—not only an example to the friends of liberty, but a terror to the oppressors of man throughout the world. *Let America have a firm, fixed policy, abroad as well* as at home; but, above all, let our policy at home be *that which* serves and preserves liberty—liberty at the fireside—liberty at home—liberty in the regulation of our local and domestic concerns. Now, my friends, why should not all conservative men—all lovers of peace and of the law—all friends of the Union—all supporters of these great principles upon which our Union was formed, and from the maintenance of which can you alone expect harmony and peace? In conclusion, permit me to return you my acknowledgements for the kindness and attention and patience you have given me to-day. I feel profoundly grateful to you, and would not be just to myself or my own feelings if I retired from the stand without making my acknowledgements for your kindness.

At the close of Mr. DOUGLAS' remarks, he was greeted with the most enthusiastic and long-continued applause.

NEW-YORK POLITICS.

OPENING OF THE STATE CAMPAIGN.

The Republican Convention at Syracuse.

Crowded Attendance and Harmonious Proceedings.

NOMINATION OF A STATE TICKET.

No Advances Made Towards a Union with the Americans.

LIST OF THE CANDIDATES

SPEECHES, RESOLUTIONS, &c.

Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.

SYRACUSE, Wednesday, Sept. 7—10 P. M.

Why WILLIAM A. WHEELER was nominated President is a profound puzzle. He presided capitally, and the Convention was delighted with his election. His speech was eloquent, "rode the brave" admirably, and was loudly applauded on both sides.

JAMES KELLY, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, urged Gen. NYE for the post. Others named SPINNER, of Herkimer; but quietly the majority said WHEELER. His friends were greatly surprised by his election. I think it was an accident.

Extraordinary harmony marked the meeting. Schuyler County always sends a double delegation. The majority report of the Committee on Contested Seats, admitting the Charles Cook delegates, was almost unanimously adopted. ORTON, of New-York, struggled hard for the nomination of State officers by ballot, but a "thundering *No*" decided for viva voce voting.

For Secretary of State LEAVENWORTH got 216 votes; SAML. A. LAW, American, 16; MONROE HALE, 15; SPENCER, 3. LAW's votes all came from the Susquehannah Valley. CARROLL declined to be a candidate. There was an effort to put MYERS on the slate for Secretary of State, but his friends peremptorily refused. He wanted to be Attorney General.

Some, anxious to put SELDEN to roost, strove to crowd him on for Attorney General, but his legion of friends preferred to save him for United States Senator. Judge BRADLEY nominated him to the Convention for Attorney General, claiming that his name was needed for the ticket.

Ex-Senator UPHAM then gave positive assurances that he would accept nothing from the State.

MYERS got 226 votes for Attorney General; Addison V. Rice, 26; and Charles S. Spencer, 13—Spencer had 10 votes from the New York delegation, namely, John A. Kennedy, Augustus F. Horr, John H. White, Harvey Wood, Orton McLeod, Cooper, Conkling, Black and Matthews.

For State Engineer, Mentz, who was ahead all day, came up with 63 votes; Goodsell, who stood next, 1; Nichols, 3; and Story, 372. Story's own delegation were surprised to learn that they could have their choice.

For Comptroller, ROSWELL DUMBLETON alone was nominated—JAMES COOK peremptorily declining. His friends, who want to save him for the next Governor, refused to let him be put out of the way, and into a berth for which they agreed no man was better fitted.

DOMESTICUS was nominated for Treasurer by acclamation. The Germans Republicans hear this with delight.

For Canal Commissioner, the slate said CHAPIN, of Albany. The Central and Western canal men wanted ROOT; the Northeast wanted BAKER. All three were good canal men. Personal and local arguments, joined with a willingness to vary the programme a little, were sufficient to endanger the slate. On the first call, CHAPIN had 102, BAKER 36, ROOT 76, and WARE 1. The opposition was strong enough then to order the roll called in reverse order, giving Albany the privilege to crown the effort at regularity with its vote. This was tried twice, ROOT gaining each time. Then the radicals, who to the number of thirty-five had met in the morning and sent a delegation to the Globe dictating terms, as the result of which came the slate, thought it an opportunity to get a fourth man on the Canal Board. The fourth call was ordered to be confined to the two highest candidates, and the result was, for CHAPIN, 147; for ROOT, 96. So CHAPIN had it, and the radicals lost their ROOT. But the Canal men are satisfied, and the motion to make the vote unanimous was carried with loud applause.

The Americans did not begin to swear aloud until it was known that they could not have even a States Prison Inspector. Senator T. [illegible], when this point was reached, moved that the rest of the slate be read and declared unanimously adopted, but it was understood that there was a vacancy here. The New-Yorkers nominated a long list, and for a time there was a "frolic."

The radical Democrats have three votes in the Canal Board—DONSHEIMER, DENNISTON and MYERS.

SYRACUSE, Thursday, Sept. 8—12½ A. M.

The regular ticket experienced another defeat on the nomination for Court of Appeals. Senator DIVEN was on the programme. E. DARWIN WILLIS SMITH and Judge BRADLEY nominated Judge WOODRUFF, and supported him eloquently. Gen. NYE and Mr DAYTON urged Judge DAVIES. Judge WRIGHT had a couple of speeches in his favor, and LATHAM spoke for DIVEN. On vote DAVIES had 86, WOODRUFF 46, WRIGHT 27, and DIVEN 30. DAVIES was urged for his American antecedents and for his Lemon decision.

The motion to confine the next voting to the two highest ruled DIVEN out. CHARLES S. SPENCER said DIVEN reported against the personal liberty bill last Winter, and the statement was very damaging at a critical moment. All are in high spirits, and think the ticket a strong one. The Resolutions, which are not read, are strong for the completion of the canals. They have no direct indorsement of Governor MORGAN, it not being according to precedent.

On the last vote all but four of the New-York delegation went for DAVIES, who had 102, and WOODRUFF 71.

GLAUCUS.

[FROM THE REPORTER FOR THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.]

SYRACUSE, Wednesday, Sept. 7.

The Republican State Convention assembled in Wieting Hall informally at 11 o'clock. At that hour the hall was crowded to its utmost capacity, the front portion being reserved for the delegates, and the rear part and galleries being reserved for outsiders.

The Convention was called to order by JAMES KELLY, Chairman of the General Committee, who, without preliminary remarks, named WARD HUNT, of Oneida, for temporary President. (Loud applause.)

Gen. NYE named Judge H. WHITE, of New-York, and Dudley E. Sage, of Cattaraugus, for Secretaries.

Mr. HUNT, on taking the Chair, said: "The duties of temporary Chairman of this Convention will be brief, and with your kind assistance easily performed. I will not delay the Convention with any remarks, but invite you at once to proceed with the business of the Convention." [Applause.]

The list of Delegates was then called, and every district in the State was found to be fully represented.

Mr. JAMES KELLY moved that a Committee of two from each Judicial District be appointed to name permanent officers. Carried.

Senator HALSTEAD moved that a Committee of five be appointed on the contested seats of Schuyler County.

Mr. ELLS objected, and desired the matter to come directly before the Convention.

The motion was carried.

The Chair then appointed the following Committee on organization:

1st.
1. James Reilly and George Folsom, of New-York.
2. H. B. Duryea, of Kings, and Robert Donaldson, of Orange.
3. H. A. Brigham, of Albany, and W. S. Kenyon, of Ulster.
4. R. A. Loveland, and Edw. Dodd, of Washington.
5. Jno. A. Haddock, of Jefferson, and Oliver Lodge of Herkimer.
6. Lyman Truman, of Tioga, and Tracy R. Morgan, of Broome.
7. W. H. Briggs, of Monroe, and D. W. Bissell, of Livingston.
8. F. P. Stevens, of Erie, and J. P. Darling, of Cattaraugus.

The following Committee on the Schuyler contested seat was appointed: J. B. Halstead, J. G. Floyd, W. Best, L. Bordeaux and S. N. Miller.

The Chairman in announcing the list begged the indulgence of the Convention, as the Chair had not had the customary assistance of having the Committee fixed beforehand. While this might make the Committee less perfect, it would be free from the charge of previous arrangement.

R. VAN VALKENBURGH moved that the Delegates from each Judicial District select three members of the State Central Committee to be reported to this Convention. Adopted.

Adjourned till 2½ o'clock P. M.

AFTERNOON SESS

THE ZEITUNG

FINANCIAL MARKETS.

BUSINESS CHANCES.

DRY GOODS.

CARPETINGS.

CLOTHING.

DENTISTRY.

DRUGGISTS' SUNDRIES.

EDUCATIONAL.

FURNITURE.

HOUSE FURNISHING GOODS.

MISCELLANEOUS.

MACHINERY.

MEDICAL.

MUSICAL.

NOTICE.

PROPOSALS.

PUBLIC NOTICES.

REAL ESTATE.

SITUATIONS WANTED.

STEAMERS.

TO LET.

WANTED.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

The Republican State Convention met at Syracuse yesterday forenoon, and completed its organization by the usual preliminary proceedings. Committees for the several Congressional districts for State Officers [illegible]

The Journal of Commerce says that the Hon. Gerrit Smith has declined the nomination for Governor, tendered him by the Democratic State Convention at Syracuse.

Board of Aldermen, and Assistant Alderman Fellows, of the Fifteenth Ward, in his stead.

Assistant Alderman Fellows was then duly sworn into office by the Clerk.

Assistant Alderman Fellows was then appointed Chairman of the Committee on Fire Department, in the place of Assistant Alderman Hall, resigned.

The Committee on Fire Department was then appointed as follows:

Assistant Aldermen Fellows, Hall, Hoffman, Hall, Hall

COAL, OIL, COKE, OIL.

TERMS REASONABLE. PROMPT ATTENTION.

STATIONERY.

PAINTS, OILS AND BRUSHES.

LEGAL NOTICES.

ADVERTISING AGENCY.

DANCING

BUSINESS CHANCES.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

ASTROLOGY

AUCTION SALES.

FINANCIAL.

INSURANCE.

STEAMBOATS.

RAILROADS.

SHIPPING.

SPORTING.

EXCURSIONS.

PROPOSALS.

MEDICAL.

TEACHERS.

PERSONAL.

MARRIAGES AND DEATHS.

BOARDING AND LODGING.

HOTELS.

AMUSEMENTS.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION.

[Continued from Third Page.]

Last evening, the Conventions of the Tammany Hall Party met, in various portions of the City, to choose delegates to the Democratic State Convention which meets at Syracuse on the 14th inst. On the evening previous the upper Assembly Districts elect. of their delegates and alternates. The following is a complete list of the delegation, excepting the Fifth District, in which there was no choice, and the election postponed until this evening:

Senators.

1. Thomas Bryan. A. C. Taylor.
2. John Clancy. George H. Purser.
3. John T. Berrue. Michael Norton.
4. Isaac Bayard. Wm. McCall.
5. No election.
6. Elijah F. Purdy. David Kissner.
7. John Richardson. Peter Duffy.
8. John Brown. Peter Boylan.
9. Wm. N. McIntyre. Peter Halpin.
10. John Cochrane. J. J. Gamblelon.
11. Peter B. Sweeny. N. J. Waterbury.
12. Bernard Kelly. Hiram Barker.
13. Peter Masterson. John Wilson.
14. Edward Cooper. Richard Murphy.
15. Andre Stronck. B. McCabe.
16. Bryan McCahill. Dennis McCarthy.
17. James McKean. Wm. Harris.

BROOKLYN INTELLIGENCE.

BOARD OF EDUCATION—THE DISTRICT SYSTEM.—The Brooklyn Board of Education held a regular meeting on Tuesday evening at their rooms on Red Hook-lane. The usual preliminary business disposed of, reports of committees were received. The School-house Committee reported that they had at length succeeded in obtaining the school-houses during the summer vacation, but that it was impossible to do so in the 4th, 17th and 6—d it 1 ward. It was then moved that the Secretary be instructed to notify the Trustees of the public schools, as directed by the Board. They have Colored School No. 1 in a very bad condition, and caused it to be reported by the Board. Thirty have Colored School No. 1 in a very bad condition, and caused it to be reported that the Secretary be instructed to notify the Trustees of the public schools, as directed by the Board. They